

May 16, 1975

operating without a program statement review happened right here on this floor this week. I read from the program statement on plant sciences which will receive action today by the Regents today on Friday May 16. In the letter of instructors from Vice Chancellor Acker regarding the Plant Science Department, this is quoting from Dr. Acker's letter. "We all realize that your projected needs were yet unreduced by critical screening. Interfacing and common usage refinements." Dr. Acker continues, "That the field operation facilities for land to be retained in the Havelock area be a separate future request package. In order to have an area for experimentation for plant science, they must have the land to use. Likewise the renovation of Kime Hall, Plant Industry and a Veterinary Science buildings for new usages will be a separate and subsequent appropriation request package." You meaning you members of the Legislature passed on a 13 million 200 dollar building. But you bought what looks like to be a \$19,000,000 package. One short additional statement. I note that the old Vet Science building will undergo major renovation. Last year we were told that it was worthless and needed an 8 million dollar animal health building which this legislature provided. The building that they told us was worthless last year to justify the new building, now is good enough for major renovation. For that reason I urge you to reject bringing back LB472.

PRESIDENT: Senator Marvel.

SENATOR MARVEL: Once again I oppose Senator Lewis in this attempt to stand between this body and a semblance of reason in regards to the appropriation of buildings. We have tried for a number of years, we have tried all kinds of years. There isn't anything that really prevents the Legislature from doing what they want to do, but we try as your appropriations committee and those who have had some experience in this area to come up with some suggestions to take advantage of the background and experience of everybody that is involved in planning for Capital Construction. What we are saying here in effect as I read this is that we can simply go ahead and appropriate and then we will worry about programs, and we will worry about justification after we appropriate the money. That is neither fair to this body, and that isn't fair to the agency and it is not fair to the tax payers of this state. Now this Legislature can continue in this area of capital construction in a hap-hazard manner if they so desire. All I can do is to stand up and tell you based upon experience, and in working with these departments that this is not the way to do it, this is not the way to give the Legislature the tools that they need so that we can insist from the departments that they come up with some kind of a reasonable approach to this problem and a reasonable direction before we spend money. May I say to you that what you are doing at the moment in 609 is a perfect example of what this will legalize. I challenge anybody on this floor, to tell me how much that Plant Science Building is going to cost tomorrow, a year from now or ten years from now. Either in the capital construction area or in the area of maintenance or repair. A perfect example of this is the field house. Who knew when we approved the field house how much it was going to cost to run that facility. I challenge anybody